

REMARKS

This amendment is being filed in response to the non-final Office Action mailed on December 24, 2009. All objections and rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 25, 32, 35, 56, 61, 65, 76, 77, 82, and 89 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1, 5, 8-13, 16, 17, 20-24, 26-31, 33, 34, 36-55, 57-60, 62-64, 66-75, 78-81, 83-85, and 87 have been amended to better claim the invention.

On entry of this amendment, claims 1-24, 26-31, 33, 34, 36-55, 57-60, 62-64, 66-75, 78-81, and 83-88 are currently pending in the application.

Applicants respectfully urge that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the application be passed to issue.

I. Allowed Claims

In the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that claims 40, 43, 46-51, 68-74, and 85-88 are allowable. See Office Action, page 4. The Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing these claims.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 because the Examiner believes this claim is indefinite. See Office Action, page 2. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 5 has been amended to remove the phrase “being free of structure and operation for operating on the second signal type”. Applicants believe that this amendment addresses the

Examiner's § 112 concerns regarding claim 5. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claim 5.

III. Claim Objections

In the Office Action, claims 5, 6, 8-13, 15-17, 19-23, 25-27, 29, 32, 33, 35-39, 41, 42, 45, 56, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64-67, 77-79, 82-84, and 89 were objected to because the Examiner believes these claims are dependent upon rejected base claims. The Examiner has indicated that the claims would be allowable if rewritten into independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. See Office Action, page 4.

Objected to claim 89 has been written into claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully urge that claims 1-23 are allowable.

Objected to claim 25 has been written into claim 24. Therefore, Applicants respectfully urge that claims 24 and 26-29 are allowable.

Objected to claim 32 has been written into claim 30. Therefore, Applicants respectfully urge that claims 30, 31, and 33 are allowable.

Objected to claim 35 has been written into claim 34. Therefore, Applicants respectfully urge that claims 34, 36-39, 41, 42, 44, and 45 are allowable.

Objected to claim 56 has been written into claim 52. Therefore, Applicants respectfully urge that claims 52-55 and 57-59 are allowable.

Objected to claim 61 has been written into claim 60. Therefore, Applicants respectfully urge that claims 60 and 62 are allowable.

Objected to claim 65 has been written into claim 63. Therefore, Applicants respectfully urge that claims 63, 64, 66, and 67 are allowable.

Objected to claim 77 has been written into claim 75. Therefore, Applicants respectfully urge that claims 75, 78, and 79 are allowable.

Objected to claim 82 has been written into claim 80. Therefore, Applicants respectfully urge that claims 80, 81, 83, and 84 are allowable.

Claims 25, 32, 35, 56, 61, 65, 77, 82, and 89 are canceled. Therefore the above objection to claims 25, 32, 35, 56, 61, 65, 77, 82, and 89 is moot.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully urge that the above objection of 5, 6, 8-13, 15-17, 19-23, 25-27, 29, 32, 33, 35-39, 41, 42, 45, 56, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64-67, 77-79, 82-84, and 89 has been overcome. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above objection to claims 5, 6, 8-13, 15-17, 19-23, 25-27, 29, 32, 33, 35-39, 41, 42, 45, 56, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64-67, 77-79, 82-84, and 89.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 7, 14, 18, 24, 28, 30, 31, 34, 44, 52-55, 57, 60, 63, 75, 76, 80, and 81 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) because the Examiner believes these claims are anticipated by Taniar, “Inheritance and Parallelization: Emerging Object-Oriented and Parallel Technologies for High Performance Database Systems” (hereinafter “Taniar”). See Office Action, page 2. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A. Claims 1-4, 7, 14, and 18

Applicants respectfully urge that Taniar fails to disclose or suggest at least ***registering at least one of the first and second signal types with a registry of the graphical modeling environment***, which is present in claims 1-4, 7, 14, and 18. Nowhere does Taniar disclose or suggest this feature.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully urge that Taniar fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 1-4, 7, 14, and 18. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-4, 7, 14, and 18.

B. Claims 24 and 28

Applicants respectfully urge that Taniar fails to disclose or suggest at least *wherein the graphical modeling environment comprises a programming environment for developing and performing scientific related functions*, which is present in claims 24 and 28. Nowhere does Taniar disclose or suggest this feature.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully urge that Taniar fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 24 and 28. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 24 and 28.

C. Claims 30 and 31

Applicants respectfully urge that Taniar fails to disclose or suggest at least *defining a second object sub-class that inherits from at least two of the base object classes, constraining one or more base class attributes in defining the second object sub-class, and instantiating an object of the second object sub-class in representing a second signal in the graphical modeling environment*, which are present in claims 30 and 31. Nowhere does Taniar disclose or suggest these features.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully urge that Taniar fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 30 and 31. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 30 and 31.

D. Claims 34 and 44

Applicants respectfully urge that Taniar fails to disclose or suggest at least *instantiating an object of the first derived class representing a derived signal type in the graphical modeling environment*, which is present in claims 34 and 44. Nowhere does Taniar disclose or suggest this feature.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully urge that Taniar fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 34 and 44. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 34 and 44.

E. Claims 52-55 and 57

Applicants respectfully urge that Taniar fails to disclose or suggest at least *rendering on a display of an electronic device a first graphical form representing the first signal type and a second graphical form representing the second signal type*, which is present in claims 52-55 and 57. Nowhere does Taniar disclose or suggest this feature.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully urge that Taniar fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 52-55 and 57. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 52-55 and 57.

F. Claim 60

Applicants respectfully urge that Taniar fails to disclose or suggest at least *creating a third class that inherits selected features from the first class and instantiating an object of the*

third class in representing a third signal type in the graphical modeling environment, which are present in claim 60. Nowhere does Taniar disclose or suggest these features.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully urge that Taniar fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 60. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claim 60.

G. Claim 63

Applicants respectfully urge that Taniar fails to disclose or suggest at least *defining a second object sub-class that inherits from at least two of the base object classes* and *constraining one or more base class attributes in defining the second object sub-class*, which are present in claim 63. Nowhere does Taniar disclose or suggest these features.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully urge that Taniar fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 63. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claim 63.

H. Claims 75 and 76

Claim 76 is canceled. Therefore, the above 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claim 76 is moot.

Regarding claim 75, Applicants respectfully urge that Taniar fails to disclose or suggest at least *providing a block in the graphical modeling environment having a structure and operation for processing a second signal representing the parent signal type, receiving the first signal at a port of the block*, and *processing a portion of the first signal in the block using the structure and operation*, which are present in claim 75. Nowhere does Taniar disclose or

suggest these features. Therefore, Applicants respectfully urge that Taniar fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 75.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 75 and 76.

I. Claims 80 and 81

Applicants respectfully urge that Taniar fails to disclose or suggest at least *providing a block in the graphical modeling environment having a structure and operation for processing a signal representing the first signal type, receiving the signal of the second signal type at a port of the block, and processing a portion of the signal in the block using the structure and operation*, which are present in claims 80 and 81. Nowhere does Taniar disclose or suggest these features.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully urge that Taniar fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 80 and 81. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 80 and 81.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing claim amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that all claims should be passed to allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-027. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: March 24, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Kevin J. Canning/
Kevin J. Canning
Registration No.: 35,470
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant